HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XLVI OCTOBER, 1955 NUMBER 4

THE GRANDSON OF BEN SIRA

HENRY J. CADBURY
PENDLE HILL, WALLINGFORD, PA.

USERS OF BIBLE TRANSLATIONS and especially makers of them have reason to be interested in the grandson of Ben Sira. He is perhaps the earliest identified person of either species. He lived in Egypt twenty-one centuries ago having arrived there, as he tells us, "in the thirty-eighth year under Euergetes the King," which is probably 132 B.C. That is of course too early to speak of a finished Bible, though he does know the law and the prophets and other books and knows them also in another tongue than Hebrew. It was another Hebrew book — what we call Ecclesiasticus — written by his own grandfather, that he himself translated into Greek. With other translations this was accepted into the Greek and Christian Bible and so has come down to us in the Septuagint, while its original in Hebrew was not ultimately so received in the Hebrew or Jewish Bible.

The translator's own name is not known. His grandfather appears to have been one Jesus, the son, or perhaps the grandson, or even great grandson of Sirach. He is conventionally and conveniently called Ben Sira in Hebrew, or Siracides in Latin or Greek — names which do not have to predicate just how many generations removed he is from Sirach. The translator is presumably two further generations later. While he is therefore only slightly more identified externally than the anonymous translators of the Greek Old Testament who preceded or followed him, we have a further personal record of him in the preface which he himself prefixed to his translation. This is a most revealing passage not only about the grandfather but about the translator himself, comparable to other translators' prefaces, as for example the introduction to the King James Bible in English "The

Translators to the Reader," [1] or to some of the Latin prefaces of Jerome.

It is to this preface along with a study of the actual translation as we have it that we must turn for a knowledge of the translation theory and practice of Ben Sira's grandson. But both these resources are limited. The preface is short and written in such a condensed and rhetorical style as to be less informative than it might be. As for the comparison of the actual original with its translation we are in considerable difficulty. The Hebrew of the book, as lately recovered in partly overlapping fragments, is not a pure original Hebrew but two different recensions or manuscripts, sometimes broken or undecipherable and with marginal variants. It may be in some places quite unrelated to the Greek. The Greek manuscripts also divide into two families, both of which share one important corruption affecting the arrangement of a section of the book, and they evidently have other mistakes both collectively and individually. A modern translator of this book is in the particularly difficult position of having to depend upon defective and inaccurate material both Hebrew and Greek as well as Latin and Syriac.

For the same reason one who would observe accurately the translator's methods is baffled. We are often unsure what Hebrew was being translated and into what Greek it was originally rendered — a kind of literary "from the unknown to the unknown." The same problem exists of course throughout the Old Testament with the Masoretic text and the Septuagint parallels, but in Ecclesiasticus the uncertainty on one side or the other is frequently greater. In spite of this fact there are enough places where the correspondence both within and between the texts of the two languages is so close as to throw some light on the probable procedure of translation.

The preface of the translator makes several statements that are congenial to his present successors. He believes that works of merit like his grandfather's deserve the effort of being made available to another cultural group. He recognizes, however, that

[1] Unfortunately the King James version in modern printings omits at the beginning of the Bible the extended address to the reader by the English translators retaining only the brief dedication to the King. It prefixes still another prologue to Ecclesiasticus before the translator's own.

translation can never be perfectly satisfactory for, as he says twice in effect, "what was originally expressed in Hebrew does not have exactly the same sense when translated into another language." [2] This divergence exists in current translations of "even the law itself, the prophecies, and the rest of the books." If it appears in his own work it will not be unique. He therefore bids his readers, "Please read with good will and attention and be indulgent in cases where, despite our diligent labor in translating, we may seem to have rendered some phrases imperfectly." Such words bring an echo in every translator's mind. The baffling difficulty of the task and the inevitableness of some imperfections are confirmed in every experience. But even to do the best he can the translator must put forth great effort. "To show zeal" is a phrase characteristic of this writer, and he applies it to his own work as he does to the labors of original authors and of artisans. Even more characteristic is his report of his own sleeplessness like that of others (*ἀγρυπνία*). Claims of diligence, skill, and self-denial do not obscure his apologetic for the deficiencies inherent in the nature of the task. As Myles Smith was to write later, on behalf of the translators of the King James version,

> it hath pleased God in his divine providence, here and there to scatter words and sentences of that difficulty and doubtfulness . . . that fearfulness would better beseem us than confidence and if we will resolve to resolve upon modesty.

The Wisdom of Ben Sira like other Hebrew poetry was written in couplets of parallel lines. This unit was easy to imitate and to supplement, as many variants show, and it was also easy to omit. The translator could not readily distinguish, and probably followed what was before him. The parallelism of meaning between the two lines can be a help to any translator, but it can also lead him to false conjectures. Our translator sometimes found parallel-

[2] That others in the ancient world recognized the inexact equivalence between Greek and a barbarian tongue is shown, as A. D. Nock reminds me, by Corpus Hermeticum xvi.1–2 (in terms very similar to those of the translator's prologue here) and by P. Oxy. 1381. In both cases the original, if not wholly fictitious, would have been Egyptian. For oral translation see H. S. Gehman, The Interpreters of Foreign Languages among the Ancients: a Study Based on Greek and Latin Sources (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1914).

ism where it did not exist and sometimes missed it where it did. Like translators since, he sometimes had difficulty in matching synonyms in the Hebrew with synonyms in the Greek and thus fell back in the second line upon a word used in the first. Where more difficult Hebrew techniques were employed, as in the acrostic poem at the end of the book, the translator would have greater difficulties.

Even in remoter contexts he showed a tendency to repetition of the same word. It was natural that a word he had once used should recur to him a few lines later. We cannot always tell whether such repetitions are his own doing — or whether, if the form as well as the word are identical, they are due to the parablepsis of a scribe. Like original authors translators tend to stick to a word once they have used it. For example in two nearby verses he uses the verb ἀφικνέομαι (43:27, 30) both in the strong future form with οὐ μή and the aorist subjunctive, and in a somewhat special sense of never succeeding. In the last ten verses of the book he uses five times the cognate forms ἐκτησάμην, κτήσασθε, κτῆμα. With the use of a concordance many examples could be added.[3]

Certain words seem to be special favorites of the author. They are used so frequently that one cannot but suspect that they are not always a good equivalent of the original. To mention but a few examples he rings the changes on συντέλεια in his book, and ἀλλοιόω occurs frequently. The verb ἐλαττόω and its noun ἐλάττωσις are apparently overused. That impression at least is confirmed by the concordance record for them with 18 and 7 entries respectively. I have already mentioned his penchant for ἀγρυπνία (9 times). Another favorite is the verb ἐνδελεχίζω and cognate words.

It is always dangerous to say that a word or a usage is unique to an ancient author. Further discovery or further reading reduces hapax legomena. Even words of Ecclesiasticus attributed by the new Liddell and Scott only to this writing or not men-

[3] Cf. R. Smend, Griechisch-syrisch-hebräischer Index zur Weisheit des Jesus Sirach, 1907. One observes that the translator uses εἰσακούειν frequently, also φόβος κυρίου but always νόμος ὑψίστου. The combination σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα (14^{18} 17^{31}) familiar in the New Testament and rabbinic writers is apparently due to the Hebrew.

tioned in the dictionary at all may not be so nearly unique as they seem. But they raise that suspicion. I may mention in the second category the compound διακριβάζω 51:19 and the transitive use four times of κοπάζω in 39:28, 43:23, 46:7, 48:10.

On the other hand the translator varies words when identity might be expected. Whether this is deliberate or accidental or now one, now the other, we cannot tell. One example will suffice. The Hebrew names for God familiar in the Old Testament, El or Elohim and Jahweh and Elyon all occur in the Hebrew of this book and are variously rendered in the Greek but very often by Most High. There are also five or six instances of El Elyon in the latter part of the book. Each time it occurs it is rendered differently in Greek.

Many of the linguistic data I have noted are in no way peculiar to translation. Writing an original document of his own the author would very likely show the same peculiarities of variation and repetition, of change of style and vocabulary, and of occasional unusual or individual eccentricities. We are not in a position to know whether the translation process occcasioned them or not. They are natural psychological phenomena, unconscious tendencies such as any of us may have and may never notice.

Another influence that has affected the Greek of Ecclesiasticus is the language of the Septuagint. That the translator knew the prior Greek translations of some of the canonical books is not only implied in the preface, as already indicated, but is sufficiently proved by his use of identical Greek with the Septuagint in the same context. This is most evident in the later chapters where he gives a catalogue of the famous men of Israel or describes in detail the accoutrements and service of the high priest. In some cases these coincidences are striking, because of the unusualness of the words, or the transfer of a word in the same context, or because as in one case both the Hebrew and the Greek of Ecclesiasticus support the Septuagint against the Masoretic text. This is the inclusion of sandals in Samuel's protestation in Samuel (I. 12:3), a book where also recent discoveries from caves of Qumran of Hebrew fragments confirm the readings of the Septuagint. It may be worth noting that he shows knowledge of the Greek of Chronicles. In describing Josiah as setting his heart

right toward the Lord (49:3), the Greek uses phrases employed in the Septuagint only in that work (of Josiah and frequently).

This dependence on the Septuagint is especially interesting when we can convict the translator of transferring a Greek word of the Septuagint passage implied by his context to a slightly different connection. This at least I suspect has happened in moving 'golden' from bells to pomegranates (45:9, cf. Exod. 28:33,34), 'congregation' from the audience to Korah's company (45:18, Num. 16:1–20), and 'visit' from Joseph's bones to Joseph's survivors (49:15, cf. Gen. 50:25). I may add that this is precisely the kind of slight transposition one finds when Luke is copying Mark.

But the translator does not always recognize his chances to echo the Septuagint. At 36:24,25 Ben Sira, in contrasting the married man and the unmarried one, includes Hebrew phrases from Genesis (2:18, 20; 4:12) about Adam and Cain respectively. The Greek translator agrees with the Septuagint in the first case, but is far removed in the second.

The traditions of translation, if not specific passages of the older Septuagint books, have established for our author the rendering of Hebrew proper names into Greek, such as Joshua the son of Nun and Caleb the son of Jephunneh and many others in the catalogue of national heroes, together with Sennacherib and Rabshakeh, etc. Elsewhere both translator and his original follow the practice so conspicuous in the Wisdom of Solomon of referring to persons and places in Hebrew history without using proper names. The Hebrew-Greek equation of Sheol and Hades is followed by this translator as by others but he was perhaps uncertain whether or not to translate Adam or Enosh in his original as the proper name of a person. So the Hebrew proper names for rivers he sometimes transliterates, sometimes translates into Greek proper names, but sometimes renders by the common noun river (ποταμός), or misses entirely. A study of the passages 24:25–27; 39:22; 44:21 and 47:14 is instructive. In this dilemma he is behaving like many of his successors when they are translating Genesis 2:11–14 and other passages in the Hebrew Bible. The word plays in the Hebrew he cannot reproduce (Rehoboam, Hezekiah) though he may be aware of them. Like the Gospel of

Matthew (1:21) he knows that Joshua (Jesus) is derived from "save." And of course the alphabetic acrostic at the end of the book is no more represented in his Greek than is the same artificiality in several other Greek translations from the Hebrew.

That he sometimes misunderstands the Hebrew is to be taken for granted. The state of the texts does not permit certainty on our part about all occasions but that such errors are very easy in Hebrew when written without vowel points or without even word divisions is obvious. So in the case of ambiguous words like 'before,' which in the Hebrew of 46:3 is probably used of place but in the Greek is translated as though it refers to time. If, as seems likely, the Hebrew text before him was sometimes ill written or miswritten or intrinsically obscure, he had like other translators no alternative except to use conjecture for the text or meaning, and not always happy ones, or to write out a literal word-for-word translation. That these renderings were sometimes nonsense conduced to their being treated in turn in the same way by later Greek scribes and by translators of his own Greek, and they have passed from bad to worse.

Most of the phenomena cited for the translator of Ben Sira are familiar to any modern translator in his own work. The problems are identical and so are the tendencies and oversights. They are mentioned not by way of criticism of the pious grandson. He had taken on, as he realized, a difficult job, and he was modest and apologetic as to his success. The modern translator cannot cast the first stone. He will instead feel a sympathy for his predecessor and will rather use the comparison as an incentive to more careful procedures, and to the use of those tools and safeguards which are available to us but were not available twenty-one centuries ago.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/harvard-theological-review_1955-10_48_4

MELETIUS OF LYCOPOLIS AND EPISCOPAL SUCCESSION IN EGYPT

W. TELFER
SELWYN COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND

THE schismatic "Church of the martyrs" [1] which arose in Egypt after the last persecution possessed, at the time of Nicaea, twenty-eight bishops besides its founder Meletius.[2] Nothing survives to tell us with what rites these men were made bishops. But the schism was so nationalist in character that it is likely to have followed Egyptian church tradition. It has been contended that this tradition, as regards episcopal succession, was peculiar, and followed a pattern different from that established for the propagation of a Catholic hierarchy by the Fourth Canon of Nicaea.[3] The aim of this article is to show that this contention finds support in the Meletian story.

The story divides into four periods. The first occupies some months of 306, after persecution had fallen with new violence upon the Christians of Egypt.[4] The Egyptian hierarchy, probably not, for the most part, of native Egyptian race, followed the same policy as the Catholic episcopate all round the Mediterranean. They did not offer open resistance to the imperial orders, but caused their churches to "go underground." [5] Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis in Upper Egypt, scorned this policy. Like the African martyrs of Alutina,[6] he would "set up the standard of the Lord" in the face of secular tyranny; for the attitude of native Egyptians to the imperial government was not that of Roman citizens. To them it seemed outrageous that they should be per-

[1] ἐκκλησία μαρτύρων, Epiphanius, Panarion, lxviii.3.

[2] Athanasius, Apol. c. Ar.§ 71.

[3] W. Telfer, Journal of Ecclesiastical History, III (1953), 1–13, "Episcopal succession in Egypt."

[4] The date is argued in connection with the martyrdom of Phileas; H. J. Lawlor and J. E. L. Oulton, Eusebius (London, 1928), II, 267.

[5] Catholic Christianity exhibits, according to Mgr. P. Batiffol (La paix Constantienne, c. 2), "un civisme convaincu." from the apostolic age to the last persecution.

[6] Or Abitina. See Acta Saturnini, Dativi et sociorum, Migne, P. L. VIII. 688–715.

secuted by Romans for their religion.[7] Accordingly, when Meletius knew that Christian liturgy had ceased in Lower Egypt, he set out to secure its revival. Where he found men willing to defy imperial orders by restoring the liturgical gatherings, he ordained them presbyters. And this he did in the territory of four bishops who were awaiting martyrdom in an Alexandrine prison. Peter, the pope of Alexandria, was in hiding. The confessor-bishops urged Meletius by letter to be directed by Peter, implying that he both could and should find him. But Meletius ignored both them and Peter. And when, after their martyrdom, Christian life in Alexandria was no longer visible, Meletius arrived in the city. He made contact with two Christian laymen, Isidore and Arius, to whom it was a grievance that preaching had ceased.[8] They put him in touch with two presbyters through whom Peter was secretly supplying support to the *canonici* and poor of the Alexandrine church, dependent for their sustenance upon the church chest.[9] Our information, here, is from the "Verona fragment" which gives us, in Latin, the narrative of an Athanasian writer.[10] He goes on to say that Meletius urged on these clerics the suitability of the time for action.[11] The action meant was presumably that desired by Isidore and Arius, the resumption, in defiance of the state, of Christian liturgy and preaching. So, says our source, Meletius severed the two presbyters from their allegiance to Peter, who had forbidden such action. Peter's letter to the Alexandrine church, which follows, speaks of Meletius having the audacity to try and sever from his authority these presbyters.[12] The phrase does not prove that Meletius did not succeed in winning them away. But his success was apparently soon

[7] The Passions of the martyrs constitute the first patriotic literature of the Copts. The Era of Diocletian, adopted in Egypt with his reforms, was turned by the Christian sentiment of Egypt into the Era of the Martyrs. See H. Delehaye, Analecta Bollandiana, XV (1922), 5–154, 299–364, "Les martyrs d'Egypte."

[8] Both are described as *doctoris habens desiderium.* Duchesne (Hist. ancienne de l'église, II, 99) gratuitously makes this into "deux docteurs ambitieux."

[9] They are described as *quibus permissum est egentes visitare.*

[10] The text is printed in M. J. Routh, Reliquiae sacrae, IV (Oxford, 1846) 91–94. For its authorship, see W. Telfer, Harvard Theological Review, XXXVI (1943), 169–246, "The Codex Verona LX (58)."

[11] *Commendans eis occasionem.*

[12] *Tantum sibi adsumpsisse ut etiam ex mea auctoritate presbyteros . . . conaretur separare.*

followed by his arrest and removal to penal servitude in mines in Palestine.[13] Why, we may ask, was he not executed, like the other bishops? Peter had an all-too-ready answer. Meletius must have bought his life by some kind of lapse.[14] The answer is not compelling. Meletius was a countryman from Upper Egypt, for whom a magistrate might think penal servitude the better sentence. And Meletius' head was unbowed. He ordained one resistance-volunteer for the Alexandrine presbytery while still in prison in Alexandria. Another followed him to Palestine, and there, in his place of servitude, received presbyterate for service in Alexandria.[15] Epiphanius grew up at Eleutheropolis in Palestine surrounded by memories of the resistance movement there. At Eleutheropolis, Gaza and Aelia, they remembered ordinations at Meletius' hands. When Epiphanius hints at many more Meletian ordinations in Palestine he may be less reliable. But what he says fits on to the evidence of the Verona fragment, to show that Meletius' arrest followed closely after his coming to Alexandria. And the two sources combine to give us a picture of a man out to rouse the Church to resistance. His lack of patience with the "underground" policy is patent. His quarrel was with the world-rulers. If it led on to a quarrel with other Egyptian bishops, and to schism, that was merely the sequel.

Yet the Athanasian writer says that Isidore and Arius divined that Meletius would make himself antipope.[16] And Peter's letter discerns his *cupiditas in principatum*. This may have been but too intelligent anticipation. Nevertheless, it may explain why the Athanasian writer elaborates the theme that Meletius accumulated the support of four who claimed the rank of presbyter in the Alexandrine church. It would give point to his narrative, if that

[13] According to Epiphanius, the mines of Phaeno in the Idumaean hills near Petra.

[14] Athanasius, Apol. c. Ar. § 59.

[15] *Meletius separavit eos* (Peter's presbyters), *et ordinavit ipse duos, unum in carcere, et alium in metallo*. Duchesne (l. c.) makes of this "Mélèce eut l'audace de les remplacer" (how could he?); "à cet effet, il choisit deux confesseurs, dont l'un était en prison, l'autre aux mines" (which makes nonsense). Clearly, *in carcere* and *in metallo* give the location of the ordainer, not of the ordained. The Athanasian writer assumes that it is known that Meletius was sent to the mines.

[16] They are described as *invidentes pontificatum B. Petri* and as recognizing the *cupiditas* or *concupiscentia Meletii*, shown (the Athanasian writer argues) by his action to gain presbyters.

added plausibility to the hint at Meletius' ambition. But if so, it hints at the importance of Alexandrine presbyters for the making of an Alexandrine pope, as well. The second period in the Meletian story extends to the release of Meletius under the toleration edict of 311. Within this period we must place an Egyptian Synod under Peter that passed sentence of deposition on Meletius,[17] as adumbrated in Peter's Verona fragment letter.[18] Meletius was condemned in absence, since Athanasius blames him for having no care to clear his name in the eyes of posterity.[19] As the Synod must replace Meletius as bishop of Lycopolis, it may have been held in Upper Egypt, where also it could take place with less danger. The charge of "sacrificing" would serve the unamiable purpose of degrading Meletius in the eyes of his people from the status of confessor, to which his sufferings in the mines might seem to entitle him. Meletius' only reply, Athanasius says, was to go into schism and revile Peter. His right course, he asserts, was to appeal for a fresh examination of his case by another Synod. Athanasius is evidently thinking of the time following the release of Meletius in 311. The Synod that deposed him may have been as much as four years before that.

The third period of the Meletian story is from 311 to Nicaea. Donatus, Lactantius' friend, who was, among other Christians, kept in prison at Nicomedia through the persecution years, was released on 30 April, 311, as soon as the amnesty to Christians was announced.[20] Something similar may have happened in the release of Meletius from the mines. He may well have regained Alexandria before Peter. His partisans there will have kept him informed of what happened in his absence, and welcomed him back, to lead, from Alexandria, the "Church of the martyrs" in Egypt. It is likely that they were in possession of a church house. And there, if we follow the pointer supplied by the Athanasian writer, we may suppose that Meletius was now enthroned

[17] Athanasius, Apol. c. Ar. § 59.

[18] *Occurram illi cum sapientibus viris, et videam quae sunt quae cogitavit.* Peter, at the time of writing, did not know that Meletius was no longer in Alexandria.

[19] *οὐδὲ ἐσπούδασεν ἀπολογήσασθαι μετὰ ταῦτα.* No such consideration would arise if he had confronted the Synod.

[20] De mortibus persecutorum, 16.

and invested antipope, in the traditional manner of Alexandrine bishops, by his presbyters. Peter's behavior, at this juncture, is that of a man disconcerted by his rival's success. Against all precedent he declared invalid the baptisms performed by Meletians, although, in so doing, he was driven to excommunicate his deacon Arius,[21] but recently won over from the Meletian interest.

In 312 Peter was thrown into prison. The immediate occasion was a synaxis in honor of the martyrs.[22] Nothing could be more conducive to a clash between the two Christian factions, of which Peter's was no doubt numerically superior. The hagiographers labor the theme that Peter suffered for the sake of his people. Eusebius declares his arrest to have been without cause,[23] which at least admits that he did not suffer under an ordinary process of martyrdom for the faith of Christ. The hagiographical sources show the orthodox *plebs*, after Peter's imprisonment, causing the greatest difficulty to the authorities, and in fact causing Maximin to order Peter's execution. With the picture before us of orthodox behavior towards the Meletians, twenty years later, preserved for us in the papyrus letters published by Sir Harold Idris Bell,[24] we may with reason suppose that the cause of Peter's "martyrdom" was breaches of the peace between his people and the Meletians. If Eusebius says that many other Egyptian bishops were put to death at the same time, there is against him the tradition that refers to Peter as the "seal" or "complement" of the martyrs, implying that he suffered alone and after all the rest. The violences of the orthodox towards the Meletians did not cease after Peter's death. For Athanasius accuses Meletius of complaining to the Emperor against Alexander, Peter's next successor but one.[25] Peter could have done nothing so effective for his cause, against that of Meletius, as in dying under the executioner's sword.

Epiphanius represents Meletius as living on amicable terms

[21] Sozomen, Hist. Eccles., I, 15.

[22] For the sources here available, see W. Telfer, Analecta Bollandiana, LXVII (1949), 117–130. "St. Peter of Alexandria and Arius." The passage here under tribute is on p. 127.

[23] Hist. Eccl., ix, 6, 2.

[24] Jews and Christians in Egypt, London, 1924.

[25] Apol. c. Ar. § 11.

with Alexander, and as being forward, in his support, against Arius.[26] It might well be that as Alexander grew in relative strength, and had new foes to engage, the orthodox attitude towards the Meletians grew milder. Athanasius, later, rails at the alliance of the Meletians with the Eusebians as if it represented an unprincipled change of side.[27]

With these better relations at the time of Nicaea in view, we are prepared for the generous inducements offered by the Synod to the Meletians to abandon their schism.[28] The determination of Constantine to have peace in the Church may go some way to explain this generosity. But when we compare the terms proposed by the Synod with those on which Alexander, with the help of Hosius, liquidated the more recent schism of Colluthus,[29] both similarities and differences are striking. In either case the leader was first convinced that he could hope for no support from outside Egypt. The zeal that carried Meletius into battle with the persecutors is stigmatized in the Synodal letter as rash indiscretion. And whereas he probably owed it to civil protection that he had been able to stand his ground in Alexandria, he could read, in the fate of Arius, Secundus and Theonas, and of the Arian party in Egypt, how little chance he stood of declining settlement. On the other hand, like Colluthus, he was offered, upon submission, restored communion and his rank in the clergy. The great difference is in the treatment offered to the clergy made by Meletius and those made by Colluthus. Colluthus, senior Alexandrine presbyter, seems, like Meletius, to have claimed to be antipope in view of a supposed forfeiture of office by the Alexandrine bishop. As antipope, he ordained a number of persons. But, while the affair of Ischyras shows that it was difficult in practice to dispose of the claims of these persons, their "ordination" was officially declared null and void. It is the more remarkable, therefore, that the Synodal letter seems to imply that the bishops of the Meletian

[26] Panarion lxviii, 4.

[27] Loc. cit., and § 59.

[28] For the text of the Synodal letter to the Egyptians, containing these terms, see Socrates, Hist. Eccles., I, 9.

[29] Athanasius, Apol. c. Ar. §§ 12, 76, and the letter of Alexander in Theodoret, Hist. Eccles, I, 4, where the action of Colluthus is called χριστεμπορία. Colluthus may have seized Alexandrine church funds for the support of his men.

faction have had a real and arguably sufficient consecration. It proposes, however, a compromise on the subject. Before receiving their status relative to the orthodox hierarchy they are to submit to a further rite; in the words of the letter, to "be confirmed by a more mystic consecration." [30] Valesius rightly contends [31] that the persons concerned are the Meletian bishops (excepting Meletius himself, perhaps). The orders of the inferior clergy serving under Meletius in Alexandria were not open to the same question as the status of the bishops made by Meletius. Valesius thinks that the "more mystic consecration" meant the imposition of Alexander's hands. But the synod had passed its Fourth Canon, prescribing the imposition of many episcopal hands, in the case of new consecrations. Now the reconciled Meletian bishops would come under obedience not only to Alexander but also to those orthodox bishops to whose thrones they would severally become heirs-apparent. And nothing could so effectively place them under the corporate authority of the orthodox as a ceremony on the lines prescribed by the Fourth Canon.[32] If the ceremony was not already familiar in Egypt, but was introduced under the prestige of the ecumenical Synod, it might both commend itself to the Meletians, and give them just that status that the Synod desired for them. In short, if we can assume that, until Nicaea, bishops in Egypt had not been made by imposition of many episcopal hands, but by, at most, only those of the occupant of the throne of St. Mark, the puzzling reference in the Synodal letter to a "more mystic consecration" ceases to be puzzling.

But things did not turn out exactly as the Synod expected. In their expectation, Meletius would retire to Lycopolis, to receive the honors (and temporalities) from which he had been deposed by Peter, but to be otherwise inactive; and the Meletian clergy would have come forward, of their own accord, for admission

[30] μυστικοτέρα χειροτονία, a rite of such spiritual efficacy that it must add something, and make good any defect. The notion is more conciliating than "conditional reconsecration."

[31] Notes on Socrates I, 9 in the second volume of his Historiae ecclesiasticae scriptores graeci.

[32] Viz., the imposition of hands by not less than three comprovincial bishops, the consent of the metropolitan, and the assent of the absent comprovincials, being indispensible.

into the orthodox clerus of Egypt. But when Alexander was at home once more, he seems to have seen his only road of access to the schismatics through the cooperation of Meletius. It is evident that Meletius was himself willing to be reconciled. But that being so, it fell to him to communicate the terms of the Synodal letter to each of his suffragans and persuade them to accept. We need not be surprised that it was into the third year before he was able to present to Alexander the whole company of persons to be reconciled [33] and to benefit under the terms of the Synodal letter. On this occasion, Meletius presented to Alexander a schedule containing, besides his own name, the names and sees of twenty-eight bishops, his suffragans in the "Church of the martyrs," together with a list of four presbyters and three deacons serving under him in Alexandria. No names of clergy ordained by his suffragans were given, though none of them can have been without at least a deacon. But perhaps such clergy were held to be "in the person" of their bishop.

We are most fortunate in having the text of this schedule. It suited the purpose of Athanasius to demonstrate that the name of Ischyras was not contained in it, and he transcribed it.[34] It enables us to deduce some facts about the Meletian schism. The first is the complete dependence of all its clergy upon their antipope. In view of the Synodal letter and the schedule alike, there is no reason to suppose that these twenty-eight bishops had, any of them, received consecration in any way but at the hands of Meletius. We may gather, also, that the first preoccupation of Meletius had been to maintain his hold in Alexandria by maintaining congregations. After that, we may suppose that he supplied a bishop for any part of the country where there was a congregation desirous of belonging to the "Church of the martyrs" and capable of supporting a bishop.

Five months after the delivery of the schedule, Athanasius says, it had become waste paper.[35] Alexander had died, Athanasius

[33] Athanasius, Apol. c. Ar., opening of § 72. Athanasius explicitly says that all the persons named in the schedule were in fact present to make their submission.

[34] Op. cit., § 71.

[35] Apol. c. Ar. § 59. Perhaps this is an exaggeration. Robertson points out (N and P. N. F. IV, p. xxi, Note 6) how Theon of Nilopolis, one of the bishops in

had succeeded him, the Meletians had repudiated his succession, and the fourth period in the Meletian story had arrived, in which the schism was no longer reconcilable. Alexander can have lived for only two of the five months, since there was an interregnum of nearly three months between Alexander and Athanasius. Nevertheless, his reception of the persons gives reason for supposing that the ceremonies were carried out, and that the fulfilment of the remaining terms of the settlement was expected. The succession of Athanasius to the bishopric of Alexandria involved, however, a breach alike of tradition and of existing agreements. Athanasius was not an Alexandrine presbyter, he did not as pope bury his predecessor,[36] and his elevation set aside the consideration of any claims a Meletian candidate might have.[37] Now there evidently were such claims awaiting consideration. It is a proof of the honesty of Athanasius' transcription of the schedule that he includes, after the name of John bishop of Memphis, the words "whom the emperor ordered to be with the archbishop." It transpires, therefore, that Constantine could not leave the churchmen to go on with their task of pacification unwatched. In his impatience, he seems to have discovered what was the flaw, from the Meletian point of view, in the terms of the Synodal letter. It was that no hope was given that the "Church of the martyrs" might place a bishop on the throne of St. Mark, and so set everything right with the Church of Egypt. Constantine, it appears, took upon him to interpret the terms of settlement so as to give John of Memphis, acknowledged leader of the Meletian interest after Meletius himself, prospective rights not in regard to the see of Memphis but to that of Alexandria. Accordingly, as we enter the fourth period of the Meletian story, it is to find a certain John as archfoe of Athanasius among the Meletians.[38] It is altogether probable that he is the same person as John of Memphis in the schedule. But he now receives the alternative appellation of

---

the schedule, appears in a Festal Letter of Athanasius as having died in possession of the orthodox bishopric.

[36] See Telfer, as in Note 3.

[37] Sozomen, Hist. Eccles., II, 17, probably drawing upon Sabinus of Heraclea. This is good evidence that an attempt was made to implement the settlement.

[38] Athanasius, Apol. c. Ar. § 17.

Archaph. Athanasius treats this as a native name.[39] Socrates improves on this by turning it into the ill-omened scriptural name of Achab.[40] But it is possible that it is really a party title, "Archapa," "supreme father," corresponding to the title Arch-iereus accorded in Coptic documents to the Alexandrine bishop. Constantine was much exercised over John Archaph, and Athanasius gives us the text of an imperial letter to John,[41] hinting at some great reward to follow upon his reconciliation with Athanasius. The latter wants us to understand, from this, that a reconciliation took place, upon which John went back. He clearly admits that it did not last, and we may doubt if it ever had been a reality. Our last sight of John is in Socrates' account of the Synod of Tyre, where John ruined his own cause through over-eagerness to ruin Athanasius.[42] This career of John Archaph goes to show that the Nicene terms of settlement were seriously accepted by the Meletians.

We need follow the Meletian story no further. It only makes sense if, in Egyptian eyes, Meletius had an arguable claim to be pope of Alexandria. It seems impossible that this rested upon episcopal intervention, since, were that so, it must have been the subject of a conspiracy of silence. The difficulty vanishes if we may suppose that succession from St. Mark was held to rest upon enthronement and investiture, duly carried out with the assistance of Alexandrine presbyters. If Meletius underwent such rites, and Peter had forfeited his office, Meletius would be his legitimate successor. The facts being so, it would be very hard to divest the ecclesiastical acts of Meletius of all validity. And that is clearly what was felt at the time. The affair of the schedule only makes sense if Egypt agreed that a pope of Alexandria could make suffragans by the imposition of his own hands alone. In this way the Meletian story seems to confirm the contention that, until Nicaea, Egyptian ideas on episcopal succession were peculiar. Elsewhere, perhaps universally, episcopal succession had long been effected by imposition of many episcopal hands; though consecrations by

[39] Op. cit. § 65. "Archaph who is also called John."
[40] Hist. Eccles., I, 30.
[41] Apol. c. Ar. § 70.
[42] Loc. cit.

the hand of one bishop were far from unknown.[43] And after Nicaea there is no reason to doubt that orthodox Egypt superimposed the requirements of the Nicene Canon upon the traditional Egyptian pattern in these matters. But if we had to suppose that, before Nicaea, the Alexandrine see, or any other Egyptian see, could only be filled by means of such episcopal intervention as the Fourth Nicene Canon prescribes, it would render the Meletian story quite incomprehensible.

[43] Gregory of Nyssa, Life of Gregory Thaumaturgus, thinks it to call for no excuse or explanation when he makes the Thaumaturge, single-handed, consecrate Alexander first bishop of Comana Pontica. A considerable list of single-handed consecrations could be compiled.

THE ROMANTIC DILEMMA IN AMERICAN NATIONALISM AND THE CONCEPT OF NATURE

PERRY MILLER
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

ON MAY 8, 1847, The Literary World — the newly founded vehicle in New York City for the program of "nativist" literature — reviewed an exhibition at the National Academy. The magazine had just undergone an editorial revolution and the new management was endeavoring to tone down the strident nationalism of the first few issues; still, the exuberant patriotism of the reviewer could not be restrained, for he had just beheld two exciting landscapes of Staten Island painted by J. F. Cropsey.

This artist, said the reviewer, must be ranked along with the acknowledged masters, Thomas Cole and Asher Durand — and this was high praise in 1847. And as do these masters, young Cropsey illustrates and vindicates the high and sacred mission of the American painter:

> The axe of civilization is busy with our old forests, and artisan ingenuity is fast sweeping away the relics of our national infancy. What were once the wild and picturesque haunts of the Red Man, and where the wild deer roamed in freedom, are becoming the abodes of commerce and the seats of manufactures. Our inland lakes, once sheltered and secluded in the midst of noble forests, are now laid bare and covered with busy craft; and even the primordial hills, once bristling with shaggy pine and hemlock, like old Titans as they were, are being shorn of their locks, and left to blister in cold nakedness in the sun. 'The aged hemlocks, through whose branches have whistled the winds of a hundred winters,' are losing their identity, and made to figure in the shape of deal boards and rafters for unsightly structures on bare commons, ornamented with a few peaked poplars, pointing like fingerposts to the sky. Yankee enterprise has little sympathy with the picturesque, and it behooves our artists to rescue from its grasp the little that is left, before it is for ever too late.

Students of the history of art recognize in this passage a doctrine that had, by 1847, become conventional among landscape

painters in Europe, England and America: that of a fundamental opposition of Nature to civilization, with the assumption that all virtue, repose, dignity are on the side of "Nature" — spelled with a capital and referred to as feminine — against the ugliness, squalor and confusion of civilization, for which the pronoun was simply "it." However, though this passage proceeds from a premise as familiar in Dusseldorf as in New York, still it takes the form of an exhortation that is seldom, if ever, encountered in the criticism of Europe. In America the artist has a calling above and beyond an accurate reporting of scenery: he must work fast, for in America Nature is going down in swift and inexorable defeat. She is being defaced, conquered — actually ravished. Civilization is leading us into a horrible future, filled with unsightly structures, resounding with the din of enterprise. All too soon we shall become like Europe. In the old world artists may indeed paint only such "garden landscapes" as are dotted here and there in a setting that man has mastered; but our noble Hudson and "the wild witchery of our unpolluted inland lakes and streams," this Nature is not man's but "GOD'S." American artists return from Europe, "their hands cramped with mannerism, and their minds belittled and debauched by the artificial stimulants of second-hand and second-rate creations." This was what America must resist, debauching artificiality. Yet if history is so irresistibly carrying the defiling axe of civilization into our sublime wilderness, will it not be merely a matter of time — no matter how furiously our Coles, Durands and Cropseys, our poets and novelists, strive to fix the fleeting moment of primitive grandeur — before we too shall be cramped into mannerism, before our minds shall be debauched by artificial stimuli?

The reader may object that I am talking nonsense. This was the expanding, prospering, booming America of the 1840's; here, if ever in the annals of man, was an era of optimism, with a vision of limitless possibilities, with faith in a boundless future. There was indeed some fear that the strife of North and South might wreck the chariot of progress, but the more that threat loomed the more enthusiastically the nation shouted the prospects of wealth and prosperity, if only in order to show the folly of allowing politics to spoil the golden opportunity. Dickens and

other foreign visitors report a republic constantly flinging into their faces preposterous vaunts about what it would shortly become, and then steadily making good its wildest boasts. Surely this society was not wracked by a secret, hidden horror that its gigantic exertion would end only in some nightmare of debauchery called "civilization"?

The most cursory survey of the period does indeed display a seemingly untroubled assurance about the great civilization America was hewing out of the wilderness. This faith, with its corollaries of belief in progress and republican institutions, might be called the "official" faith of the United States. It was primarily an inheritance from the eighteenth century: back in 1758, the almanac-maker, Nathaniel Ames, writing from Dedham, Massachusetts, dreamed that within two hundred years arts and sciences would transform nature "in their Tour from Hence over the Appalacian Mountains to the Western Ocean," and that vast quarries of rocks would be piled into cities. On the whole, despite the Jeffersonians' distrust of cities, I think it fair to say that the founders had no qualms about doing harm to nature by thrusting civilization upon it. They reasoned in terms of wealth, comfort, amenities, power, in terms which we may conveniently call, though they had not been derived from Bentham, "Utilitarian."

Now in 1840, in 1850, the mighty tread of American civilization was heard throughout the Ohio Valley, across the Mississippi, and the advanced guard was rushing into California. But the astonishing fact about this gigantic material thrust of the early nineteenth century is how few Americans would any longer venture, aside from their boasts, to explain, let alone to justify, the expansion of civilization in any language that could remotely be called that of utility. The most utilitarian conquest known to history had somehow to be viewed not as inspired by a calculus of rising land values and investments but (despite the orgies of speculation) as an immense exertion of the spirit. Those who made articulate the meaning of this drama found their frames of reference not in political economy but in Scott and Byron, in visions of "sublimity." The more rapidly, the more voraciously, the primordial forest was felled, the more desperately poets and

painters — and also preachers — strove to identify the unique personality of this republic with the virtues of pristine and untarnished, of "Romantic," Nature.

We need little ingenuity to perceive that behind this virtually universal American hostility to the ethic of Utilitarian calculation lies a religious mood — one that seventeenth-century Puritanism would not have understood, and which was as foreign, let us say, to the evangelicalism of Whitefield as to the common-sense of Franklin. We note, first of all, that this aversion to the pleasure-pain philosophy became most pronounced in those countries or circles in which a vigorous Christian spirit was alive. In the long run, a host of the emotions excited in the era we call Romantic were mobilized into a *cri du coeur* against Gradgrind. A host of nameless magazine writers uttered it on the plane of dripping sentiment, of patriotic or lachrymose verse, but on higher levels the poet Bryant, the novelists Cooper and Simms, the painters Durand and Cole — and on still more rarefied heights the philosopher Emerson — denounced or lamented the march of civilization. In various ways — not often agreeing among themselves — they identified the health, the very personality, of America with Nature, and therefore set it in opposition to the concepts of the city, the railroad, the steamboat. This definition of the fundamental issue of life in America became that around which Thoreau, Melville and Whitman organized their peculiar expression. They (along with the more superficial) present us with the problem of American self-recognition as being essentially an irreconcilable opposition between Nature and civilization — which is to say, between forest and town, spontaneity and calculation, heart and head, the unconscious and the self-conscious, the innocent and the debauched. We are all heirs of Natty Bumppo, and cannot escape our heritage. William Faulkner, notably in "The Bear," is only the most dramatic of recent reminders.

Now, in this epoch, American Protestants were especially hostile to Utilitarianism, even to the conciliatory form promulgated by John Stuart Mill. In England there were elements in the general situation which supported him, which could rally to his side a few sensitive and intelligent Christians. Sensitive and intelligent Christians in America were so constantly distressed by the

charge that America was utterly given over to the most brutal utilitarianism that they in effect conspired to prevent the appearance of an American Mill. The more their consciences accused them of surrendering historic Christian concerns to the rush of material prosperity, the more they insisted that inwardly this busy people live entirely by sentiment. A review of the gift-books and annuals of the 1830's and 1840's — if one can bring himself to it — will tell how, at that pitch of vulgarity, the image of America as tender, tearful, dreaming noble thoughts, luxuriating in moonlit vistas, was constructed. These works were produced in huge numbers for the predominant middle-class — if the term be admissible; they reposed on the parlor tables of wives whose husbands spent all day at the office pushing the nation on its colossal course of empire. But the more sophisticated or learned disclaimers of utility said, in this regard, about the same thing. An organ of Episcopalian scholarship, The New York Review, declared for instance in 1837 that Utilitarianism is a "sordid philosophy." And why? Because it teaches that virtue is the creature of the brain, whereas true righteousness is "the prompt impulse of the heart." Yet this Review, with no awareness of inconsistency, was at the same time rigorously preaching that because of the fall of Adam the impulses of the natural heart are suspect!

There is one truism about the early nineteenth century which cannot too often be repeated: in one fashion or another, various religious interests, aroused against the Enlightenment, allied themselves with forces we lump together as "Romantic." In England the Established Church was surprised, and momentarily bewildered, to discover that Scott, Wordsworth and Coleridge started new blood pulsating through its veins, expelling the noxious humors of indifference, Deism and scepticism. At Oxford, Romantic religiosity indeed swung so far to the other extreme that it carried Newman all the way to Rome. (His conversion so shattered the ranks of Episcopalian naturalists in America that The New York Review, finding itself unable to speak for a united body, had to discontinue.) On the Continent there appeared a Romantic Catholicism which could afford not to answer but to disregard the *philosophes* as being no longer relevant. However, this ecstasy of Romantic piety did not always require institutions;

it could amount simply to a passionate assertion against the Age of Reason. Carlyle and Chateaubriand might have little love for each other, but they could embrace on one piece of ground: they could dance together on the grave of Voltaire.

Everywhere this resurgence of the Romantic heart against the Enlightened head flowered in a veneration of Nature. Wordsworth did speak for his era when he announced that he had learned to look on her not as in the hour of thoughtless — that is, eighteenth-century — youth, but as one who heard through her the still, sad music of humanity. This was not the nature of traditional theology: neither the law of nature of the scholastics, nor the simple plan of Newtonian apologists. It was Nature, feminine and dynamic, propelling all things. Wordsworth had no such vogue in America as had Scott or Byron, but he helped enthusiasts for both of them to find more precise, more philosophical, formulations for their enthusiasm. As early as 1840, Emerson could say, "The fame of Wordsworth is a leading fact in modern literature," because Wordsworth expressed the "idea" he shared with his coevals. Evert Duyckinck was a thorough New Yorker and thus despised Emerson's metaphysics; still, on reading The Prelude, Duyckinck hailed Wordsworth as one entitled to join the band of immortals "whose voices go up to Heaven in jubilant thanksgiving and acknowledgment of the Great High Priest, in whose temple they perpetually worship." And Wordsworth had taught both transcendentalist Emerson and Episcopalian Duyckinck that

> One impulse from a vernal wood
> May teach you more of man,
> Of mortal evil and of good
> Than all the sages can.

With so many Americans severally convinced that this had become ultimate truth, was not a further reflection bound to occur to a nation that was, above all other nations, embedded in Nature: if from vernal woods (along with Niagara Falls, the Mississippi, and the prairies) it can learn more of good and evil than from learned sages, could it not also learn from that source more conveniently than from divine revelation? Not that the nation would formally reject the Bible. On the contrary, it could even

more energetically proclaim itself Christian and cherish the churches; but it could derive its inspiration from the mountains, the lakes, the forests. There was nothing mean or niggling about these, nothing Utilitarian. Thus, superficial appearances to the contrary, America is not crass, materialistic: it is Nature's nation, possessing a heart that watches and receives.

In American literature of the early nineteenth century, this theme is ubiquitous. Social historians do not pay much attention to it; they are preoccupied with the massive expansion and the sectional tensions. Probably John Jacob Astor and the builders of railroads gave little thought to the healing virtues of the forests and swamps they were defiling. The issue I am raising — or rather that the writers themselves raised — may have little to do with how the populace actually behaved; nevertheless, it has everything to do with how the people apprehended their conduct. If there be such a thing as an American character, it took shape under the molding influence of these conceptions as much as under the physical impositions of geography and the means of transport.

So, let me insist upon the highly representational quality of an essay by one James Brooks, published in The Knickerbocker in 1835, which so phrased the theme that it was reprinted over the whole country. Manifestly, Brooks conceded, this country *seems* more dedicated to matter than to mind; there is indeed a vast scramble for property, and no encouragement is given the arts. But, though foreigners may sneer, we need not despair; we do not have to reconcile ourselves to being forever a rude, Philistine order. In the future we shall vindicate our culture, if only we can preserve our union. For this confidence, we have the highest authority:

> God has promised us a renowned existence, if we will but deserve it. He speaks this promise in the sublimity of Nature. It resounds all along the crags of the Alleghanies. It is uttered in the thunder of Niagara. It is heard in the roar of two oceans, from the great Pacific to the rocky ramparts of the Bay of Fundy. His finger has written it in the broad expanse of our Inland Seas, and traced it out by the mighty Father of Waters! The august TEMPLE in which we dwell was built for lofty purposes. Oh! that we may consecrate it to LIBERTY and CONCORD, and be found fit worshippers within its holy wall!

Walt Whitman had for years been drugging himself upon such prose; in him the conception comes to its most comprehensive utterance, so self-contained that it could finally dismiss the alliance with Christian doctrine which Romantic Christians had striven to establish. However, he was so intoxicated with the magniloquent idea that he had to devise what to contemporaries seemed a repulsive form, and they would have none of it. Nevertheless, Whitman's roots reach deep into the soil of this naturalistic (and Christianized) naturalism. Today a thousand James Brookses are forgotten; Whitman speaks for a mood which did sustain a mass of Americans through a crucial half-century of Titanic exertion — which sustained them along with, and as much as, their Christian profession.

That is what is really astounding: most of the ardent celebrators of natural America serenely continued to be professing Christians. Or rather, the amazing fact is that they so seldom — hardly ever — had any intimation that the bases of their patriotism and those of their creed stood, in the slightest degree, in contradiction. Magnificent hymns to American Nature are to be found among Evangelicals and Revivalists as well as among scholarly Episcopalians. If here and there some still hard-bitten Calvinist reminded his people of ancient distinctions between nature and grace, his people still bought and swooned over pseudo-Byronic invocations to Nature. It was a problem, even for the clearest thinkers, to keep the orders separate. For example, The New York Review in January, 1840, devoted an essay to foreign travelers, saying that their defect was an inability to behold in America not the non-existent temples and statues but the "Future":

> A railroad, a penitentiary, a log house beyond the Mississippi, the last hotly-contested elections — things rather heterogeneous to be sure, and none of them at first glance, so attractive as the wonders of the old world — are in reality, and to him who regards them philosophically, quite as important, and as they connect themselves with the unkown future, quite as romantic.

For some pages the Review keeps up this standard chant, and then abruptly recollects its theology. Confidence in the American

future, it remembers barely in the nick of time, must not betray us into the heresy of supposing man perfectible: "Tell a people that they are perfectible, and it will not be long before they tell you they are perfect, and that he is a traitor who presumes to doubt, not their wisdom simply, but their infallibility." Assuredly, the American Christian would at this point find himself in an intolerable dilemma, with his piety and his patriotism at loggerheads, did not the triumphant ethos seem to give him a providential way out: America can progress indefinitely into an expanding future without acquiring sinful delusions of grandeur simply because it is nestled in Nature, is instructed and guided by mountains, is chastened by cataracts.

It is here that errors are rebuked, and excesses discountenanced. Nature preserves the identity and the individuality of its various races and tribes, and by the relation in which each stands to her, and the use which each makes of her, she becomes both a teacher and an historian.

So then — because America, beyond all nations, is in perpetual touch with Nature, it need not fear the debauchery of the artificial, the urban, the civilized. Nature had somehow, by a legerdemain that even so highly literate Christians as the editors of The New York Review could not quite admit to themselves, had effectually taken the place of the Bible: by her unremitting influence, she, like Bryant's waterfowl, would guide aright the faltering steps of a young republic.

Here we encounter again the crucial difference between the American appeal to Romantic Nature and the European. In America, it served not so much for individual or artistic salvation as for an assuaging of national anxiety. The sublimity of our natural backdrop not only relieved us of having to apologize for a deficiency of picturesque ruins and hoary legends: it demonstrated how the vast reservoirs of our august temple furnish the guarantee that we shall never be contaminated by artificiality. On the prairies of Illinois, Bryant asked the breezes of the South if anywhere in their progress from the equator have they fanned a nobler scene than this?

Man hath no part in all this glorious work:
The hand that built the firmament hath heaved

> And smoothed these verdant swells, and sown their slopes
> With herbage, planted them with island-groves,
> And hedged them round with forests.

Goethe might insist in ancient Germany that he devoted his life to Nature, but in Europe this meant that he became an elegant genius domesticated in the highly artificial court of Weimar. What could Europe show for all of Rousseau's tirades against civilization but a band of Bohemians, congregated amid the brick and mortar of Paris, trying to keep alive a yearning for such naturalness and spontaneity as any child of the Ohio Valley indubitably flaunted without, like them, becoming outcast from society? America, amid its forests, could not, even if it tried, lose its simplicity. Therefore let Christianity bless it.

But — could America keep its virtue? As The Literary World's exhortation to the artists reveals, almost as soon as the identification of virtue with Nature had become axiomatic, the awful suspicion dawned that America was assiduously erecting the barriers of artifice between its citizenry and the precious landscape. If God speaks to us in the sublimity of Nature, then was not the flood of pioneers a devilish stratagem for drowning the voice of God? In the same issue that printed Brooks's "Our Country," The Knickerbocker also carried an oration on the Mississippi River, declaring that no words can convey what an American feels as he looks upon this moving ocean, because he sees not only the present majesty but the not distant period when the interminable stretch of vacantness shall become bright with towns, vocal with the sounds of industry: "When the light of civilization and religion shall extend over forests and savannahs." Or, as the same magazine vaunted in 1838, "Nature has been penetrated in her wildest recesses, and made to yield her hidden stores." But how could we at one and the same time establish our superiority to artificial Europe upon our proximity to Nature, and then view with complacency the rapidity of our despoiling her? And furthermore — most embarrassing of questions — on which side does religion stand, on Nature's or on civilization's? Once the dichotomy had become absolute, as in American sentiment it had become, then piety could no longer compromise by pretending to dwell in both embattled camps.

Once more, in Europe the problem was personal, a matter of the individual's coming to terms with himself, absorbing a taste for Nature into his private culture. Here it was a problem for the society — and so for the churches. Goethe had put it for Europe: the young revel in those aspirations of the sublime which in fact only primitive and barbaric peoples can experience; vigorous youth pardonably strives to satisfy this noble necessity, but soon learns circumspection:

> As the sublime is easily produced by twilight and night, when forms are blended, so, on the other hand, it is scared away by the day which separates and divides everything, and so must it also be destroyed by every increase of cultivation, if it is not fortunate enough to take refuge with the beautiful and closely unite itself with it, by which these both become immortal and indestructible.

By recognizing that the sublime is ephemeral, for a nation as for a person, Goethe inculcated the necessity of a mature reconciliation to the merely beautiful, in order to preserve a fugitive glory, one which might, by adroit cultivation, survive into a weary civilization as a memory out of the natural sublimity of youth. But the beautiful is only ornament, amenity, decoration. A nation cannot live by it, neither can a faith. It is far removed from the voice of God thundering out of lofty ridges and roaring waterfalls. Even the painter Cole in 1841 published "The Lament of the Forest," by which, he seemed to say, he found at the end of his self-appointed task only a tragic prospect. The forest stood for centuries, sublime and unsullied, until there came man the destroyer. For a few centuries thereafter, America was the sanctuary; now, even into it comes artificial destruction:

> And thus come rushing on
> This human hurricane, boundless as swift.
> Our sanctuary, this secluded spot,
> Which the stern rocks have guarded until now,
> Our enemy has marked.

It was this same Thomas Cole, this master interpreter of the American landscape whose death in 1848 was, according to The New York Evening Mirror, "a national loss," who most impressed his generation by five gigantic canvases entitled "The Course of

Empire." The first shows the rude, barbaric state of man; the second is a perfect symbolization of that pastoral conception with which America strove to identify itself. Presiding over each scene is a lofty and rocky peak, which patently represents Nature, but in the pastoral panel, and only in this one, the point of view is shifted so that there can be seen looming behind and above the peak of Nature a still more lofty one, which even more patently is the sublime. In the third cartoon the perspective returns to that of the first, but the entire scene is covered with a luxurious civilization, only the tip of mountain Nature peering over the fabulous expanse of marble. In the fourth, barbarians are sacking the city, and the picture is a riot of rape, fire, pillage; in the fifth, all human life is extinguished, the temples and towers are in ruin, but the unaltered mountain serenely presides over a panorama of total destruction.

The orator who in The Knickerbocker anticipated the civilization to arise along the Mississippi was obliged to warn the young empire to learn from the history of the past, from the follies of the old world: it must so improve the condition of the *whole* people as to "establish on this continent an imperishable empire, destined to confer innumerable blessings on the remotest ages." Yet like so many vaunters of American confidence in this ostensible age of confidence, by admitting the adjective into his exhortation he indirectly confesses the lurking possibility of the perishable. Cole's "Course of Empire" was exhibited over and over again to fascinated throngs of the democracy; the series ought, said George Templeton Strong in 1838, "to immortalize him." Cole made explicit what the society instinctively strove to repress: the inescapable logic of a nationalism based upon the premises of Nature. (Many, even while forced into admiration, noted that the drama as Cole painted it, he being both a pious Christian and a devout Wordsworthian, left out any hint of Christianity; the "Empire" is wholly material, and there is no salvation except for the mountain itself.) The moral clearly was that a culture committed to Nature, to the inspiration of Nature and of the sublime, might for a moment overcome its barbarous origins, take its place with the splendor of Rome, but it was thereby committed to an ineluctable cycle of rise and fall. The American empire was still

ascending, rising from Cole's second to his third phase. But if this rationale explained America, then was not the fourth stage, and after it the fifth, inescapable?

The creator of Natty Bumppo and of Harvey Birch (who was a vestryman and a close friend of Cole) grew worried. As Cooper reissued The Spy in 1849, he could only marvel at the immense change in the nation since 1821, when the book had first appeared. America had now passed from gristle into the bone, had indeed become a civilization, and had no enemy to fear — "but the one that resides within." In his mingling of anxieties and exultations, Cooper is indeed the central interpreter of his period; even while glorifying the forest-born virtue of America, he had also portrayed the brutal Skinners in The Spy and the settlers in The Pioneers who wantonly slaughter Nature's pigeons.

It would not be difficult to show how widespread, even though covert, was this apprehension of doom in the America of Jackson and Polk. Of course it was so elaborately masked, so concertedly disguised, that one may study the epoch for a long time without detecting it. Yet it is there, at the heart — at what may be called the secret heart — of the best thought and expression the country could produce. So much so, indeed, that some patriots sought escape from the haunting course of empire by arguing that America was no more peculiarly the nation of Nature than any other, that it had been civilized from the start. For instance, in 1847 The Literary World noticed a work on the prairies by Mrs. Eliza Farnham which once more appealed to the piled cliffs, the forest aisles, the chant of rushing winds and waters in the West against the decadence of Eastern civilization. The New York journal, conscious of the city's daily growth, had to ask if this tedious declamation was not becoming trite. After all, the World demanded, when men go deeper and deeper into wild and sublime scenes, do they in fact put off false and artificial ways? Do they become spontaneously religious? Unfortunately, we must admit that some of the fairest portions of the earth are occupied by the most degraded of mankind; even sublimity works no effect on the rude and thoughtless, and so, instead of following a fatal course from the primordial to the metropolitan, perhaps we should try to stabilize this society at the merely decent and sane.

"Moral and aesthetic culture require something more than the freest and most balmy air and mellow sunshine."

The World did not quote Goethe to justify this escape from the cycle of naturalism, but Emerson, who did know his Goethe, could never successfully resolve within himself the debate between Nature and civilization, solitude and society, rusticity and manners. In fact, something of the same debate went on through most of the fiction and poetry, and markedly among the architects and landscape gardeners, of the time. Very few of those who found themselves impelled in both directions consciously tried to find their way into civilization because, thanks to Cole, they had peered into the frightful prospect of Nature. Still, I think it can be demonstrated that some vague sense of the doom was at work in all of them, as it surely was in both Cooper and Simms. As the implications of the philosophy of natural destiny forced themselves upon the more sentient, these were obliged to seek methods for living in civilization, all the more because civilization was so spectacularly triumphing over the continent. A growing awareness of the dilemma informed the thinking of Horace Bushnell, for instance, and he strove to turn American Protestantism from the revival, associated with the lurid scenery of Nature, to the cultivation of "nurture" which could be achieved only in a civilized context.

Of course, there was also the possibility of escape from the cycle of empire in another direction, opposite to that chosen by Bushnell. The nation could resolutely declare that it is invincibly barbaric, that it intends to remain so, and that it refuses to take even the first step toward civilization. Or at least, if the nation as a whole shrunk from such audacity, if Christians fled for protection to older sobrieties they had come near to forgetting, a few brave spirits might seek the other spiritual solution, though they had to defy the palpable evidence of economic life and to renounce a Christianity that was proving itself incapable of mediating between forest and city. They would refuse to be content with the beautiful, they would defiantly wear their hats indoors as well as out, and would sound a barbaric (and American) yawp over the roof of the world. Possibly there were, in sum, no more than three Americans who chose this violent resort,

and in their time they were largely ignored by their countrymen. Yet Whitman, Thoreau and Melville speak for this society, and to it, in great part because, by making their choice, they thrust upon it a challenge it cannot honestly evade. In 1855 Melville pictured John Paul Jones in Paris as a jaunty barbarian in the center of the very citadel of civilization; exclaiming over his incorruptibility amid corruption, Melville apostrophized: "Intrepid, unprincipled, reckless, predatory, with boundless ambition, civilized in externals but a savage at heart, America is, or may yet be, the Paul Jones of nations."

Possibly the fact that America came to its first essay in self-analysis and self-expression in the period we call Romantic is only fortuitous. But perhaps there is a deeper conjunction. The suspicion that we are being carried along on some massive conveyor belt such as Cole's "Course of Empire" is hard to down. It is more nagging today than it was around the year 1900, when for the moment America could give up the dream of Nature and settle for a permanently prosperous civilization. It more pesters the religious conscience in our time, when a leading theologian expounds the "irony" of American history, than it did when the most conscientious were absorbed in "the social gospel." So, it is no longer enough to dismiss the period of Romantic America as one in which too many Christians temporized their Christianity by merging it with a misguided cult of Nature. No scorn of the refined, no condescension of sophisticated critics toward the vagaries of Romance, can keep us from feeling the pull: the American, or at least the American artist, cherishes in his innermost being the impulse to reject completely the gospel of civilization, in order to guard with resolution the savagery of his heart.

In that case, the savage artist poses for the Christianity of the country a still more disturbing challenge, as Thoreau, Melville and Whitman posed it: if he must, to protect his savage integrity, reject organized religion along with organized civilization, then has not American religion, or at any rate Protestantism, the awful task of reëxamining, with the severest self-criticism, the course on which it so blithely embarked a century ago, when it dallied with the sublime and failed to comprehend the sinister dynamic of Nature?

THE MESSENGER OF GOD IN HECATAEUS OF ABDERA

Despite the well-known and well-attested tradition that the Law was given by angels, W. D. Davies has recently presented a case for interpreting δι' ἀγγέλων in Josephus, Antiquities, 15:136 as a reference not to angels but to the prophets as ambassadors of God.[1] Together with other arguments he adduces the fact that in the LXX the word ἄγγελος is occasionally used to refer to prophets and priests, and for the latter he cites Malachi 2:7 (sic, not 2:1), where a priest is described as *angelos Kyriou*. Thus a Greek precedent for the usage of Josephus may be found as early as ca. 250 B. C., the approximate date of the LXX.

Actually an even earlier and rather more striking parallel may be found in what is perhaps the earliest Greek record of Jewish religion,[2] the fragment of Hecataeus of Abdera preserved in Diodorus of Sicily, 40:3. The relevant passage is as follows: τὴν δὲ τοῦ πλήθους προστασίαν δίδοσθαι διὰ παντὸς τῷ δοκοῦντι τῶν ἱερέων φρονήσει καὶ ἀρετῇ προέχειν. τοῦτον δὲ προσαγορεύουσιν ἀρχιερέα, καὶ νομίζουσιν αὐτοῖς ἄγγελον γίνεσθαι τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ προσταγμάτων. τοῦτον δὲ κατὰ τὰς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τὰς ἄλλας συνόδους φησὶν ἐκφέρειν τὰ παραγγελλόμενα, καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος οὕτως εὐπιθεῖς γίνεσθαι τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ὥστε παραχρῆμα πίπτοντας ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν προσκυνεῖν τὸν τούτοις ἑρμηνεύοντα ἀρχιερέα. προσγέγραπται δὲ καὶ τοῖς νόμοις ἐπὶ τελευτῆς ὅτι Μωσῆς ἀκούσας τοῦ θεοῦ τάδε λέγει τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις. ("Authority over the people is regularly vested in whichever priest is regarded as superior to his colleagues in wisdom and virtue. They call this man the High Priest, and they believe that he acts as a messenger to them of God's commandments. It is he, we are told, who in their assemblies and other gatherings publishes these injunctions, and the Jews are so docile in such matters that straightway they fall to the ground and do reverence to the High Priest when he expounds the commandments to them.[3] And at the end of their laws there is even appended the statement: [4] 'These are the words that Moses heard from God and declares unto the Jews'.")

[1] HTR, XLVII (1954), 135–140.

[2] So W. Jaeger, Journ. Rel. 18 (1938), 127–143.

[3] This seems to be a bit of standard Oriental coloring: cf. Herodotus 3:128 for reverence paid to the rolls of Darius, and see S. Lieberman, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine (New York, 1950) 9, n. 34 for a collection of later parallels.

[4] The reference, inexact and at best obtained by hearsay, is perhaps to Deut. 29:1.

The text of Hecataeus comes to us at third hand. Diodorus may be assumed to have understood his source and drawn upon him intelligently. Unfortunately this passage of Diodorus comes to us not through the reasonably reliable Excerpta Historica of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, but through Photius; and as we know from the few places where we have a control (notably in Diod. 34/5:2), Photius often condenses to the point of obscurity, or even misrepresentation. The present passage too has probably been abbreviated. Still, in a matter so close to his heart as the history and culture of the Jews, it is reasonable to suppose that Photius has not done violence to the views originally expressed, the more so as he takes occasion to denounce them. On the whole therefore the text we possess may be fairly considered as approximately faithful to Hecataeus, even if not his *ipsissima verba*.

Hecataeus probably included the account of the Jews in his Aegyptiaca,[5] a tendentious historical work written under Ptolemy I,[6] of which the purpose was in part to show that Egypt was the true *metropolis* of near-Eastern culture. The story of the Exodus could easily be made to give apparent support to this theory, but Hecataeus himself seems to have had little first-hand acquaintance with Jewish practices and probably none at all with the Hebrew Scriptures, since these were not yet available in Greek. Hence whatever he has learned of Judaism, even when his information may have come from Jewish informants at Alexandria, is remolded, as Jaeger has well shown, into Greek patterns of thought.

It is not surprising therefore that the prophetic aspects of Judaism were unintelligible to him. His Moses is in part the ideal Greek *nomothetes*, in part the philosopher, and he appears to have regarded the High Priest essentially as the successor to Moses, both as the highest civil authority and as a mouthpiece for the continuing revelation of God's will. If he has heard at all of the historical prophets, with their confident assertion of "Thus saith the Lord," this has served at the most to color his picture of the high priesthood, and has been incorporated in it.[7] The telescoping of the two functions is no doubt in the

[5] See F. Jacoby, FGrH III a (Kommentar), pp. 46–51 for a discussion of the 'Judenexkurs' and its relation to the work as a whole. It was perhaps a variant, given by Hecataeus, to his account of Egyptian colonization (cf. Diod. 1:28–29). The question of authenticity for the separate work Περὶ Ἰουδαίων ascribed to Hecataeus need not concern us, but for a more liberal view than that allowed by Jacoby cf. A. T. Olmstead, JAOS 56 (1936), 243–44.

[6] Jacoby, op. cit., 32–33, apparently favors a date early in the reign, with 315/4 as the probable *terminus ante quem*.

[7] The function that he ascribes to the High Priest is surely prophetic in character, and has nothing in common with the priestly oracles, *urim*.

main untrue to history.[8] But while his words cannot, certainly, be pressed as evidence for Jewish attitudes or practices of the late fourth century B. C., it is at least interesting and perhaps significant that he gives no hint of a doctrine of angels, and knows of no intermediary between God and the Jewish nation other than the man to whom has fallen the sacred office of High Priest.

FRANCIS R. WALTON

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

[8] But for the occasional ascription of powers of prophecy to the High Priest, cf. John 11:51, and the parallels cited by Bauer, especially Josephus, Bell. Jud. 1:69. I have not seen the article by Ernst Bammel, ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΥΣ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΕΥΩΝ, in Theol. Lit. Z. 79 (1954), 351 ff.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Antiche e Nuove Edizioni Degli Opuscoli di San Tommaso D'Aquino e il Problema Della Loro Autenticità. [*Per*] *Giovanni Felice Rossi, C.M.* Piacenza, Collegio Alberoni, 1955. 73 p. (Monografie del Collegio Alberoni, N. 22)

The Augsinian Concept of Authority. *Presented by H. Hohensee.* . . . Folia, Supplement II, November 1954. 79 p.

Cardinal Newman's Doctrine on Holy Scripture, According to His Published Works and Previously Unedited Manuscripts. *By Jaak Seynaeve.* . . . Louvain, Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1953. xxviii, 408, 160 p. (Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis. Dissertationes ad gradum magistri in Facultate Theologica vel in Facultate Iuris Canonici consequendum conscriptae. Series II. Tomus 45)

La Christologie de Saint Irenèe. *Par Albert Houssiau.* Louvain, Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1955. xx, 277 p. (Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis. Dissertationes ad gradum magistri in Facultate Theologica vel in Facultate Iuris Canonici consequendum conscriptae. Series III. — Tomus I.

Epistola Sancti Iacobi; Introductio et Commentarius [*by*] *P. Theophilus Garcia Ab Orbiso, O.F.M. Cap.* Romae, Facultas Theologica Pontificii Athenaei Lateranensis, 1954. xv, 291 p. (Lateranum. Nova Series. An. XX, N. 1–4)

Faith, Reason and Modern Psychiatry; Sources for a Synthesis. [*Edited by*] *Francis J. Braceland.* New York, P. J. Kenedy & Sons [1955]. xv, 310 p.

The First World War in American Thought (to 1929). Abstract of a Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the American University in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for Ph.D. *by A. John Alexander.* Published *by the Author*, 1955. 6 p.

Der Glaubensbegriff des Hl. Augustinus in Seinen Ersten Schriften bis zu den Confessiones. [*Von*] *P. Magnus Loehrer OSB.* Einsiedeln, Benziger Verlag [1955] 280 p.

God's Plan and Man's Destiny. *By Viola Mary Cameron.* . . .With a preface by Cornelius Van Til . . . Philadelphia, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1955. 159 p.

The Grandeur and Misery of Man. [*By*] *David E. Roberts.* New York, Oxford University Press, 1955. xi, 186 p.

A Guide to a Good Marriage. [*By*] *Richard M. Steiner.* Boston, Beacon Press [1955]. 136 p.

Handbuch der Textkritik des Neuen Testaments. *Von Heinrich Vogels.* Bonn, Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1955. viii, 236 p. 2 Auflage.

A History of Training for the Ministry of the Church of England in England and Wales from 1800 to 1874. With an Introduction from 1539 to 1799 and an Appendix of Notes on Training for the Ministry of the Anglican Communion Outside England and Wales from 1539 to 1874. *By F. W. B. Bullock* . . . St. Leonards-On-Sea, Budd & Gillatt, 1955. viii, 164 p.

Une Inscription Gravée sur un Vase Cultuel Mithriaque. Par W. *Vollgraff.* Amsterdam, Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Mattschappij, 1955. 14 p. facs. plate. (Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, AFD. Letterkunde. Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 18, No. 8)

Le Mouvement Oecumenique. Efforts Faits pour Réaliser l'Union ou le Rapprochement des Eglises Chrétiennes. [*Par*] *P. Arminjon* . . . Paris, P. Lethielleux, Éditeur [1955]. 93 p.

Die Mythologische Gnosis mit einer Einleitung zur Geschichte und Methodologie der Forschung. *Von Hans Jonas.* 2. durchgesehene Auflage. Goettingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954. xvi, 375 p. (Gnosis und spaetantiker Geist, Erster Teil)

The Old Story of Salvation [*by*] *Sophia Lyon Fahs.* Boston, Published by Starr King Press. Distributed by the Beacon Press [1955]. xvi, 191 p. front. illus.

Saint Thérèse and Her Mission: the Basic Principles of Theresian Spirituality. *By Abbé Andre Combes.* Translated *by Alastair Guinan.* New York, P. J. Kenedy & Sons [1955] x, 244 p.

Der Schmerz im Alten Testament *von Dr. Josef Scharbert.* Bonn, Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1955. 235 p. (Bonner Biblische Beitraege, 8)

The Scrolls from the Dead Sea. [*By*] *Edmund Wilson.* New York, Oxford University Press, 1955. vi. 121 p.

Sex in Christianity and Psychoanalysis [*by*] *William Graham Cole.* New York, Oxford University Press, 1955. xiv, 329 p.

Symbols of Christ; the Old Testament; the New Testament. *By Damasus Winzen.* . . Drawings *by William V. Cladek.* New York, P. J. Kenedy & Sons [1955]. 103 p.

Von der Mythologue Zur Mystischen Philosophie. *Von Hans Jonas.* Goettingen Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954. xv, 223 p. (Gnosis und spaetantiker Geist, Zweiter Teil/erste Haelfte)

Correction: In the Note by Paul Winter, *"οτι* Recitativum in Luke I, 25, 61, II, 23, in the July Number on page 213, lines 1–2 the words "preposition *ὅτι*" should read conjunction *"οτι*.